

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff-Respondent,	§	
	§	
V.	§	CRIMINAL ACTION NO. H-06-421
	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. H-13-0604
ADNAN MIRZA,	§	
	§	
Defendant-Movant.	§	

ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pending is Defendant/Movant Adnan Mirza's § 2255 Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence (Document No. 304), and the Government's Response(s) thereto (Document Nos. 312, 336). The Court has received from the Magistrate Judge a Memorandum and Recommendation recommending that Mirza's § 2255 Motion be DENIED and DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE. Mirza has filed Objections (Document No. 237) and Amended Objections (Document No. 344) to the Memorandum and Recommendation, in which he objects to virtually every finding and holding of the Magistrate Judge. The Court, after having made a *de novo* determination of Mirza's § 2255 Motion and briefing, the Government's Response(s), the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum and Recommendation, and Mirza's Objections and his Amended Objections to the Memorandum and Recommendation, is of the opinion that the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge, which are detailed, comprehensive, and well analyzed in light of controlling legal precedents and authorities, are correct

and should be and hereby are accepted by the Court in their entirety. Therefore,

It is ORDERED and ADJUDGED for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge signed and filed on August 15, 2014, which is adopted in its entirety as the opinion of the Court, that Movant Adnan Mirza's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct Sentence (Document No. 304) is DENIED and DISMISSED with prejudice. It is further


ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is DENIED. A certificate of appealability from a habeas corpus proceeding will not issue unless the petitioner makes "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This standard "includes showing that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further." Slack v. McDaniel, 120 S. Ct. 1595, 1603-1604 (2000) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Stated differently, where the claims have been dismissed on the merits, the petitioner "must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Id. at 1604; Beazley v. Johnson, 242 F.3d 248, 263 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 122 S.Ct. 329 (2001). When the claims have been dismissed on procedural grounds, the petitioner must show that "jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid

claim of the denial of constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling." Slack, 120 S. Ct. at 1604. A district court may deny a certificate of appealability *sua sponte*, without requiring further briefing or argument. Alexander v. Johnson, 211 F.3d 895, 898 (5th Cir. 2000).

For the reasons set forth in the Memorandum and Recommendation, which has been adopted as the opinion of the Court, the Court determines that reasonable jurists would not debate the correctness of any of the substantive rulings.

The Clerk will enter this Order and send copies to all parties of record.

Signed at Houston, Texas this 8TH day of December, 2014.


EWING WERLEIN, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE